



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,577	09/23/2003	Wu Chou	502042-A-01-US (Chou)	3052

7590 08/07/2008
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/07/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/668,577	Applicant(s) CHOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuoc H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on April 28, 2008. Previous office action contained claims 1-22. Amendment filed on April 28, 2008 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, pending claims 1-22 are presented for further consideration and examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed April 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive

a. The applicant argues in page 2 last two paragraphs for claims that the provisional application of the cited reference by Gailey does not disclose the feature of generating push content in a server, responsive to information received in the server from the enterprise application, the push content being deliverable from the server to the mobile client device over wireless.

The examiner respectfully submits that the examiner acknowledges that the provisional application of the cited reference by Gailey does not cite exactly as the cited reference. However, the context of both provisional application and cited reference are the same. General Figures of the cited reference are logically seen in Figures pages 2 and 6-7 (e.g. there are multiple pages 2). In addition, the

Art Unit: 2143

push content is clearly addressed in the provisional application under the push services from the server to the mobile in wireless network.

- b. The applicant argues in page 3 for claims that the cited reference by Gailey does not qualified as prior art since the applicant submitted a declaration of prior invention in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.131.

The examiner respectfully submits that the declaration of prior invention does not anti-date of the provisional application of the cited reference by Gailey. Thus, the examiner has used the provisional date of the cited reference by Gailey to properly make rejection. The declaration of prior invention does not anti-date of the provisional application since the provisional application has dated as early as October 3, 2001 and thus prior to the April 19, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haller et al. (Hereafter, Haller) U.S. Pub. 2004/0068649.

Re claim 1, Haller discloses a method for use in providing interaction between an enterprise application and a mobile client device in a communication system, the method comprising the steps of: generating push content in a server, responsive to information received in the server from the enterprise application, the push content being deliverable from the server to the mobile client device over a wireless network; and receiving in the server from the mobile client device, responsive to the push content, a request for additional information identifiable at least in part by the push content, the additional information being deliverable from the server to the mobile client device over the wireless network.

Re claim 2, Haller further discloses the server comprises a wireless secure server.

Re claim 3, Haller further discloses the enterprise application is separated from the wireless secure server via an enterprise firewall, the enterprise application being inside the enterprise firewall and the wireless secure server being outside the enterprise firewall.

Re claim 4, Haller further discloses the enterprise application and the wireless secure server are implemented as elements of a common processing platform.

Re claim 5, Haller further discloses the common processing platform comprises an enterprise communication server.

Re claim 6, Haller further discloses the enterprise application comprises a dialogue server configurable for use in conducting a multimodal dialogue between the enterprise application and the mobile client device.

Re claim 7, Haller further discloses the mobile client device registers with the enterprise application through interaction with the wireless secure server.

Re claim 8, Haller further discloses the wireless secure server comprises a password-protected register connector through which registration information associated with the mobile client device is supplied from the wireless secure server to the enterprise application.

Re claim 9, Haller further discloses the wireless secure server is operative to obtain user and device profile information from the mobile client device, and to store the profile information temporarily until the profile information is extracted from the wireless secure server by the enterprise application.

Re claim 10, Haller further discloses the wireless secure server communicates with the mobile client device utilizing wireless application protocol (WAP).

Re claim 11, Haller further discloses the push content is deliverable from the wireless secure server to the mobile client device via a series connection of a push initiator and a push proxy gateway.

Re claim 12, Haller further discloses the request for additional information is deliverable from the mobile client device to the wireless secure server via a WAP gateway.

Re claim 13, Haller further discloses the additional information is deliverable from the wireless secure server to the mobile client device via a WAP gateway.

Re claim 14, Haller further discloses the wireless secure server comprises an application connector coupled to the enterprise application and utilizable in generating at least one of the push content and the additional information.

Re claim 15, Haller further discloses the push content comprises at least one embedded uniform resource identifier (URI), and the additional information is identifiable by the at least one embedded URI.

Re claim 16, Haller further discloses the request for additional information is initiatable in the mobile client device utilizing a single-key operation.

Re claim 17, Haller further discloses the request for additional information initiates a WAP pull operation that pulls the information from a content generator associated with the wireless secure server and displays it on the mobile client device.

Re claim 18, Haller further discloses the push content is generated by the wireless secure server responsive to an event trigger generated by the enterprise application subsequent to receipt in the enterprise application of an interaction request from the mobile client device and authentication of a corresponding user by the enterprise application.

Re claim 19, Haller further discloses the push content is generated in the form of a service indication (SI) including at least one notification message and at least one corresponding URI.

Re claim 20, Haller further discloses the mobile client device is configured to support a wireless networking protocol and the wireless secure server is operative to communicate with the mobile client device via an access point compliant with the wireless networking protocol.

Re claim 21, it is an apparatus of claim 1. Thus, claim 21 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 22, it is a machine-readable storage medium of claim 1. Thus, claim 22 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Phuoc H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2143

July 28, 2008